

reasonable interpretation” of a claim is not made in vacuum; instead, the broadest reasonable interpretation is one **that is consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach**. (See M.P.E.P. 2111, citing *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2000), and *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)). Initially, given the fact that the preamble of claim 11 clearly recites “an impact sensor” and the body of claim 11 recites only one “sensor element,” claim 11 would not make any sense if the “sensor element” did not relate to the “impact sensor” of the preamble. Furthermore, given the disclosure in the present specification regarding the sensor element (1, 20) of the impact sensor, it is simply unreasonable to contend that those skilled in the art would interpret “a sensor element” of claim 11 to encompass any type of sensor element.

While Applicants completely disagree with the Examiner’s assertion, Applicants have amended claim 11 to eliminate this issue of contention, i.e., by clarifying that the “sensor element” recited in claim 11 is an “impact sensor element.” Applicants note that this amendment should be entered since it raises no new issue. As explained in the previous Amendment, the Watson and Nozoe references do not disclose or suggest an impact sensor element, i.e., both Nozoe and Watson teach an angular velocity sensor instead of an impact sensor recited in claim 11.

Independent of the above, claim 11 recites an “impact sensor configured for a self-test” where the impact sensor includes “an arrangement for carrying out a filter correction dependent on a response signal of the filter to a test signal, wherein the filter correction is realized as a parametrization of a triggering algorithm for restraint means, and wherein the first signal is used to control the restraint means.” The Watson reference clearly does not disclose or suggest such an impact sensor. In addition, the Nozoe reference also does not disclose or suggest an arrangement for carrying out a filter correction dependent on a response signal of the filter to a test signal, **wherein the filter correction is realized as a parametrization of a triggering algorithm for restraint means, and wherein the first signal is used to control the restraint means.** Nozoe may describe supplying a test signal to tune a sensor circuit in order to negate the distorting effects of several capacitors (see, e.g., *Nozoe*, parag. [0144]), but nothing in Nozoe discloses or suggests that the filter correction is realized as a parameterization of a triggering algorithm for restraint means,

since nothing in Nozoe discloses or suggests that the filter correction is realized as a **parameterization of any algorithm** at all.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Nozoe and Watson.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claim 11 under consideration is in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

 (R. No. 36,197)

Dated: September 14, 2007

By: SONG LEE for Gerard Messina
Gerard Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646